

15 August 2010.

Dear Mrs. Draper,

The following is my response to your preliminary decision (see File 23) – rendered on the 26th of July 2010 – regarding my complaint against the University of Leicester (Ref: OIA/09223/10), which you have found to be not justified.

I. CAVEAT

Before I even proceed to address your preliminary decision, I wish to express my deep reservations about the OIA's independence and impartiality and my equally deep reservations about your integrity.

My reservations imply serious mistrust and deserve an explanation. Given the nature and history of this case, I have no reason whatsoever to take anything coming out of Britain at face value. It is therefore imperative to establish if the OIA's independence and impartiality are not compromised by government directives, in which case I would subject myself to yet another kangaroo court. It is equally important to establish if you, as final adjudicator, are exercising your duties in compliance with the law and with the ethical requirements of your profession, and not in fear of the OIA Board's retaliation or out of a sense of misplaced self-interest (be it in the context of professional self-preservation or professional self-realisation).

To establish this I have asked three simple questions that deserve an answer, but that you have refused to answer (see File 6 & 7), despite the fact that the OIA promises full transparency and that, according to rule 11.10 of the OIA's Regulations, the Independent Adjudicator "*may publish individual decisions and digests of complaints in anonymised form and statistical information*". The questions are:

1. Is the OIA aware of previous complaints of censorship and if so how many?
2. Is the OIA under a government directive not to investigate complaints about the existence of a covert surveillance and censorship program of the academic environment?
3. Is the OIA aware that the government's CONTEST document imposes conditions upon HEIs that are previously unheard of and that are illegal?

Your refusal to answer these questions are in contradiction to the OIA's stated transparency and statistical and record keeping practices, which leads me to believe that the OIA has something to hide. This places you, as adjudicator of the case, in a legally untenable position since the law does not permit an adjudicator to judge cases if he/she is in a conflict of interest situation and

especially if the adjudicator is bound by secret government directives that run counter to the interests of justice. I remind you here that upon becoming a solicitor you took an oath that “*You shall not pervert the law to favour or prejudice anyone, but in all things shall conduct yourself truly and with integrity.*”

Establishing the OIA’s independence and impartiality and your integrity as an adjudicator is therefore not only warranted by the history and nature of this case, but a necessary precondition if justice is to be served. Otherwise, the entire process is an exercise in futility.

What also raises suspicion and reinforces the notion that the OIA is neither independent nor impartial is the narrow interpretation you have given this case, an interpretation that is unnecessarily myopic and blindsided, and that runs counter to the leeway you have to adjudicate the cases before you. I quote:

The Court of Appeal has given the OIA broad discretion to decide upon the nature and extent of reviews it undertakes in individual cases. The OIA will continue to use this discretion to offer mediation as part of a flexible approach, though it is clear that the OIA is primarily an adjudication service. (p. 12, OIA Annual Report 2009)

While the Court of Appeal gives the OIA “broad discretion” you have chosen the narrowest of perspectives, which, as it so happens, is also the only perspective that enables the British government to conceal the existence of the surveillance and censorship program I have identified and whose existence is the root cause of my grievance.

In light of the above, I submit my comments to your preliminary decision with the caveat that the OIA has refused to live up to the transparency it promises and to use the authority it has, therefore throwing its independence and impartiality in doubt, and that your integrity as an adjudicator has been compromised because there is reason to believe that you are in a conflict of interest situation and may even have hidden agendas.

If the OIA cannot address CONTEST’s intrusion into the academic environment and its violation of privacy rules and expressional rights, then it should explicitly state this so that a different body can assume jurisdiction and investigate what are clear and egregious legal and ethical breaches. The seriousness of these breaches cannot be overlooked, for in so doing the OIA makes itself an active party to the British government’s and to Leicester University’s unlawful actions and to their attempt to cover up the truth. By avoiding to even mention the British government’s surveillance and censorship program in your preliminary decision and Leicester’s collaboration in implementing it, you are committing an act of deliberate obfuscation and in so doing become an accessory to several violations of human and civil rights, the most important of which, given your legal status as adjudicator, is the right to a free and fair trial, a right enshrined in both British and European law.

Given that the OIA appears to be bound by a secret government directive to conceal the existence of the spy program I have identified and that you, as the adjudicator of the case may be in a conflict of interest situation, it would have been appropriate for you to follow rule 6.9.2 of the OIA’s Regulations and recommend that “*the complaint would be better considered in*

another forum”. Considering the history, nature and scope of this case, I believe only an authority outside Britain would have the necessary independence and impartiality to render a fair and just verdict, and the necessary authority to investigate breaches and violations of the law that originate within the Government of the UK. The proper forum for this, as far as I can ascertain, is the European Court of Human Rights at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg.

It is my hope that in reconsidering your preliminary decision you will show the courage and integrity necessary to make such a recommendation.

II. RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY DECISION

Your decision that my complaint is unjustified is based on the following pillars: (1) that the university followed its regulations and procedures properly, (2) that any decision it made was reasonable in all the circumstances, (3) that the university has provided me with the remedy I was seeking, and (4) that my decision to withdraw from the course was voluntary. All four pillars are based on material errors and are therefore ill-constructed. I will now set out to dismantle them one by one in order to erect a true picture of reality in place of the fiction you have created.

II.1. In regards to your assertion that I voluntarily withdrew from the course

I will start with your last assertion, namely that my decision to withdraw from the course was voluntary, which you have expressed in paragraph 22 of your preliminary decision.

My decision to withdraw from the course was anything but voluntary; it rested on conditions imposed on me by the university, conditions that created an atmosphere which made it impossible for me to continue either the course or the program, an atmosphere that borders on harassment and that can only be construed as the result of a concerted effort to force me out of the program.

The conditions in question are: (1) the university’s absurd insistence that the marks I received for activities 3 and 4 were fair, (2) the university’s refusal to alter the marks, (3) the course tutor’s censorship of the forum discussions in lesson eight, (4) the course tutor’s refusal to return the week’s forum to the subject at hand, (5) the course tutor’s repeated derogatory comments towards me, (6) the course tutor’s refusal to issue an apology or at the very least to agree to disagree, and (7) Dr. Rofe’s attempt to bully me into submission by forcing me to apologise for allegedly having insulted my fellow students (a page taken straight from Oxford’s book).

All of these conditions and occurrences made my continuation in the course impossible. Furthermore, they were not accidental but deliberate. They describe an escalating effort on the part of Mr. Wright and Dr. Rofe to make my participation in the course so unpleasant, and my work so blatantly misevaluated as to force me to quit.

Your assumption that I withdrew from the course voluntarily is therefore false because it ignores the above facts, all of which are clearly documented. I believe it is necessary to re-evaluate this assumption since it is based on premises you have not disclosed and that are clearly false, and because it ignores the facts and defies the record.

II.2. In regards to your assertion that the university has provided me with the remedy I was seeking

The remedy I sought from the very beginning was the fair evaluation of my e-tivity 4 and respect for my forum contributions. Although I appealed to the course tutor's better nature and subsequently to Dr. Rofe for fair treatment and fair evaluation, I was granted neither.

Exasperated by the lack of fairness I encountered in Mr. Wright and Dr. Rofe, by their refusal to address my grievances (please review my email correspondence with Mr. Wright and Dr. Rofe), and by the absence of a higher authority within the university to seek remedy from for my grievances, I had no choice but to withdraw from the program and attempt to at least recover my tuition fees before demanding justice from a body outside the university.

Every appeal for remedy I made, before and after being forced out of the program, indicates clearly that my discontent begins and ends with the lack of fairness with which my e-tivities 3 and 4 were marked and the disrespectful manner in which my forum contributions were criticised. The two Formal Complaints Forms I filled out (one for Professor Phythian and the other for Professor Murphy, see File 1 & 2) state the cause of my discontent clearly and unequivocally, as so do my emails to Mr. Wright and Dr. Rofe.

Believing that I had exhausted all avenues of appeal for fair evaluation of my assignments and fair treatment of my forum contributions, I demanded the refund of my tuition fees. Tuition fee refund, however, was not the remedy I sought but merely the only remedy I could get from Leicester University. At no time did Mr. Wright, Dr. Rofe, Professor Phythian, or Professor Murphy inform me that if "*there appears to have been a procedural irregularity in the conduct of the examining or assessment process*" or if "*there appears to be evidence of prejudice or bias in the conduct of the assessment process*" students may grieve and appeal and that "*students will also be advised that they may seek the help of the Education Unit in the Students' Union in deciding whether they wish to appeal and in formulating their submission*" (see File 3, p. 9, General Regulations 2009/10). I stumbled upon this critical piece of information only two days ago, while researching if Leicester University had indeed followed its own regulations and procedures, as you have confidently stated in your preliminary decision. The text I have quoted appears under the heading "fair assessment of assignments" in the university's General Regulations. Not only does the university's concealment of this avenue of recourse represents a breach of its own regulations, it is also evidence that in withholding this from me the university intended to get rid of me as fast as possible and that no one at the university ever intended to facilitate or accommodate a resolution of my grievances.

II.3. In regards to your assertion that any decision Leicester University made was reasonable in all the circumstances

II.3.a. It was not reasonable for the university to maintain that the mark I received for e-tivity 4 was fair. As I have demonstrated in my letter to Dr. Rofo, the mark I received for the said assignment was not even logical let alone fair. Professor Murphy realised that the mark I was given is indefensible, which is why in her decision the most she could say to address my dissatisfaction with the way my assignment was assessed is that I was “*offered suggestions about how [I] could get a good mark for the subsequent essay*” and that “*a distinction level mark for the module was still a possibility for [me]*” (see File 4, point 4 of Professor Murphy’s decision) – in other words, that I could still make up for the unfairness of Mr. Wright and Dr. Rofo. This is a clear departure from the explicit support her colleagues had previously offered in defence of the way my e-tivity 4 was evaluated and demonstrates that the decision Leicester University made in this regard was not reasonable in all the circumstances and that this was tacitly recognised, though not explicitly stated, by Professor Murphy.

II.3.b. It was not reasonable for Mr. Wright to censor the forum discussion in week 8 (see File 5), for Dr. Rofo to insist that I apologise when I was the insulted party seeking an apology, and for any and all who have considered my appeal to refuse to address and condemn the course tutor’s repeated derogatory comments towards me. All of these acts and omissions, if addressed at the right time and in the right manner, would have allowed me to stay in the program and would have avoided the pretence that passes for adjudication in the current politicised and censored environment of Britain’s HEIs.

II.3.c. It was not reasonable (or for that matter ethical) for Dr. Rofo to assure me that at Leicester University the academic environment is sacrosanct (see File 24) when knowing full well that a government agent was embedded in the course I attended for the sole purpose of censoring the academic environment according to the dictates of CONTEST, or for Professor Murphy to lie on record when declaring that Mrs. Carla Liuzzo is not a secret debate facilitator masquerading as a regular student but a “regular student of the university” (see File 4), knowing full well Mrs. Liuzzo’s real identity and true purpose, and that her failure to disclose this robbed me of a fair adjudication process and thus denied me justice.

II.3.d. You have decided that Leicester University made a reasonable decision when refusing to hear my case at the final procedural review stage – which would have been chaired by the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor – because in refunding me the tuition fees the complaint was resolved. The assertion that my complaint was resolved, however, is wrong since it ignores the reality that although I was refunded my tuition fees, I was not given satisfactory answers to the seven issues I raised in my appeal to Professor Murphy. As such, my complaint was and still is unresolved. I remind you that the main purpose of the OIA scheme is to “*review unresolved complaints by*

students about acts and omissions of HEIs” (p. 1, OIA Rules). The very fact that my complaint is before you proves that my complaint is unresolved. For who is in a better position to judge if a complaint has been resolved than the complainant? My complaint remains unresolved because Leicester University has acted in ways that violate the sanctity of the academic environment, human rights, privacy laws, and the Education Act, and because its adjudication process has omitted admitting and confronting wrongdoings in its assessment of assignments practices, in its adherence to freedom of speech promises, in its commitment to privacy laws, and in its enforcement of its own regulations.

II.4. In regards to your assertion that the university followed its regulations and procedures properly

With characteristic disdain for the facts and an uncanny ability to see and hear no evil, you have managed to identify only one deviation from the regulations.

Here are those you have missed (I have highlighted in red the particular aspects of the regulations the university failed to comply with to underscore that there are multiple breeches within particular regulations), all of which are to be found in the university’s General Regulations (see File 3):

II.4.a. regarding freedom of speech, on page 32 of the General Regulations

Regulations Concerning Freedom of Speech

1. The University regards it as a fundamental principle of its existence as an independent academic institution that *freedom of speech within the law should be respected on its premises and in all its activities*. No individual or body of persons shall be prevented from studying, or participating in any academic activity, or being invited to deliver a lecture, or delivering a lecture, or complying with a contract of employment with the University, solely on account of their political, religious or other opinions and beliefs.

Basis of Jurisdiction

2. These regulations are approved by the Council, in accordance with its authority under the Charter and Statutes of the University. *They also constitute the Code of Practice required by Section 43 of the Education (No 2) Act 1986, which states, inter alia, that every individual and body of persons concerned in the government of the University shall take such steps as are reasonably practicable to ensure that freedom of speech within the law is secured for members, students and employees of the University and for visiting speakers; and that the Council shall issue and keep up to date a code of practice setting out the procedures to be followed in connection with the organisation of meetings and other activities, and the conduct required in connection with any such meeting or activity.*

Scope of Authority

3. *The provisions of these Regulations, and of any procedures duly instituted in accordance with them, shall apply in full to all employees, students, honorary and visiting staff and any other members of the University within the meaning of Section 2 of the Statutes, and to all persons and associations occupying property of the University other than by leasehold.*

4. All persons to whom the Regulations apply are under an obligation to take no action which would hinder freedom of speech within the law, or which would prevent the University, the Vice-Chancellor or any of its Officers from discharging their duty to ensure freedom of speech so far as is reasonably practicable.

Enforcement

27. Any infringement of these Regulations shall be subject to the established disciplinary procedures of the University appropriate to the person or persons concerned. In respect of students, infringement may be classified as an offence within the terms of the Code of Student Discipline; and in respect of employees of the University, infringement may be regarded as a breach of contract of employment. If any actions involve breaches of the law, the University will assist the prosecuting authorities to implement the process of law, and, subject to the provisions of the Code of Student Discipline, will suspend disciplinary proceedings pending the outcome of any such processes.

Freedom of speech and Section 43 of the Education (No 2) Act 1986 were overtly breeched in week 8, when the course tutor changed the discussion about Al Qaeda – and then refused to return to the subject at hand – because the tenor of that discussion was not going according to CONTEST’s script. Although Mr. Wright’s censorship act constituted a clear infringement of the university’s Regulations and of the law, he was neither subjected to disciplinary procedures nor investigated by prosecuting authorities, as dictated by section 27 of the Regulations. CONTEST, of course, has annihilated freedom of speech and its enforcement the moment that document was drafted.

II.4.b. regarding fair assessment of assignments, on pp. 9 & 10 of the General Regulations

A student’s appeal should be made on the appropriate appeal form which should be submitted with supporting evidence to the Quality Office within two months of the decision to terminate studies being confirmed in writing to the student. The official notification will state the deadline for submitting an appeal. Only the following grounds for appeal will be considered:

(a) A student is in possession of evidence about the reasons for their academic performance which, for good reason, was not available to the Board of Examiners or which was only partially available (for example if additional medical evidence has been obtained).*

(b) There appears to have been a procedural irregularity in the conduct of the examining or assessment process.

(c) There appears to be evidence of prejudice or bias in the conduct of the assessment process.

In order to comply with CONTEST’s censorship objectives, Leicester University circumvents expelling students outright and instead creates an unbearable environment for the students they want to expel. The university achieves this by unfairly assessing and criticising the forum posts and the written assignments of the targeted students – which is the treatment I received – knowing full well that even if a student reaches the OIA with his/her complaint the OIA does not have the mandate or authority to consider complaints that relate to matters of academic judgment. Since matters relating to prejudice or bias in the conduct of the assessment process

can be pursued only at the university level, any and all incidents of censorship are thus buried within the university.

II.4.c. regarding academic dishonesty, see p. 14 of the General Regulations (although this refers to students, what applies to the goose applies to the gander)

Academic Dishonesty

The University's primary functions of teaching and research involve a search for knowledge and the truthful recording of the findings of that search. Any action knowingly taken by a student [and by extension by an employee] which involves misrepresentation of the truth is an offence which the University believes should merit the application of very severe penalties.

Cooperating with CONTEST to subject students to covert surveillance and censorship to achieve the British government's hidden agendas is pure and simple not only academically dishonest behaviour but also ethically unacceptable behaviour on the part of Leicester's faculty members. This behaviour betrays the student-teacher relationship, perverts the sanctity of the academic environment, and punishes students in ways that disenfranchise them of their human rights and of educational, economic and professional opportunities.

II.4.d. regarding the thoughtful and sympathetic address of student complaints, see p. 17 of the General Regulations

Where students feel that their legitimate expectations are not being met, or where misunderstandings about the nature of the University's provision occur, the University expects that problems will be speedily and effectively dealt with at local level. Its complaints mechanism is based on the assumption that staff will at all times deal thoughtfully and sympathetically with students' problems, so as to minimise the extent to which formal procedures need to be followed.

Even the most fleeting examination of the record will reveal that my complaints have not been dealt with thoughtfully or sympathetically by Leicester University's faculty or staff. Quite the contrary, the people involved have acted in underhanded and duplicitous ways first to censor me, then intimidate me, and finally create an environment so inimical and unfair as to force me to quit the program.

II.4.e. regarding data protection, see p. 19 of the General Regulations

Data Protection Act

- *The Data Protection Act 1998 regulates the processing of personal data whether it is held on a computer or on manual files. 'Personal data' means any information relating to a living individual, and 'processing' means almost anything done with it,*

including, for example, storing it. The Act also gives individuals certain rights of access to personal data held about them by others.

- *Student members of the University are permitted to process personal data only for use in connection with their academic studies or research. They may do this only with the express prior permission of their Head of Department, and only in accordance with any Guidance or Code of Practice issued by the University and in force from time to time (whether or not those activities are carried out on equipment owned by the University and whether or not they are carried out on University premises). This means that **the personal data must be: fairly and lawfully obtained; be accurate; be kept up-to-date; be held securely; not be put onto an Internet site or taken outside of the European Economic Area without the consent of the individual concerned; and be deleted or destroyed when it is no longer relevant to retain it.***

Giving secret government agents unencumbered access to students' personal data and to their most intimate and honest thoughts posted on course forums and in written assignments is a clear and gross violation of the Data Protection Act. More than this, the information is gathered by foreign nationals in the employ of the Qatar Foundation, which means that the data is taken out of the EC, without the knowledge let alone the consent of the individuals concerned, to be used and abused any which way the British and Qatari intelligence agencies wish. The Data Protection Act is thus violated in every respect, both in the letter and the spirit in which it was written.

II.4.f. regarding completion of procedures letter, see p. 18 of the General Regulations

At the conclusion of the appeal, the student will be sent a completion of procedures letter and details about the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

As I have already documented, Leicester University has refused to issue a completion of procedures letter even though I requested it on two separate occasions.

III. POINT BY POINT RESPONSE TO THE PRELIMINARY DECISION

III.1. Regarding paragraph 16

I believe you have not considered all the material necessary to make a decision about the complaint. A judicious analysis would have sought and considered information regarding the existence of the surveillance and censorship program I have exposed, the true identity of Carla Liuzzo, and Leicester University's collaboration with CONTEST. However, you have not required Leicester University to provide any such information.

III.2. Regarding paragraph 17

The fact that several issues I have raised “have not completed the University’s internal procedures” is not due to my negligence or to my failing to raise these issues and to demand their resolution, but to the University’s reluctance or outright refusal to address them. As such, this should not be an impediment for the OIA to investigate and to consider the issues in question, but rather an incentive.

Furthermore, sub-paragraphs d, e, g, h, i and j are all directly related to sub-paragraph c (“The University engaged in censorship and thus perverted the sanctity of the academic environment.”), which is the very marrow of my complaint, and to a lesser degree to sub-paragraph f (“The University lied about the true identity and purpose of an individual who is clearly a covert government agent masquerading as a student.”). Paradoxically, you have not addressed either sub-paragraph c or f in your preliminary decision. This omission, of course, has allowed you to avoid any mention of the covert surveillance and censorship program I have identified and exposed, as well as any mention of Leicester’s collaboration with CONTEST. Had you addressed sub-paragraphs c and f you would have had to address the remaining sub-paragraphs as well, since they are all interconnected.

Furthermore, to have formulated my initial complaint to the university as specifically as I have in sub-paragraphs d, e, g, h, i and j would have required that I had *a priori* knowledge of CONTEST and Leicester’s cooperation with it, and of Carla Liuzzo’s true identity as a covert government agent operating from Doha, Qatar. This knowledge, however, came only later; while seeking fair treatment and fair evaluation for my assignments and forum posts and subsequently while seeking tuition fee refund. The hurdle to the claimant the OIA raises through the rule that a complaint cannot be considered unless exhausted by the University’s internal complaints procedure is impassable since it requires that I had *a priori* knowledge of the University’s collaboration with the secret services and of their shameful practice of covertly embedding government agents into university courses where they masquerade as common students while performing duties that cover information gathering, censorship of the academic discourse, as well as assisting the course tutors in deflecting and diverting the forum discussions away from subjects that the government deems taboo when the opinions expressed by students run counter to Britain’s foreign or domestic policies. More importantly, in this case it is unnecessary to require such specificity and *a priori* knowledge since all omitted sub-paragraphs are directly related to sub-paragraphs c and f, which should have been addressed by your preliminary decision, but have not been addressed.

The causal chain, I remind you, is as follows: (1) the British government imposes CONTEST on Leicester University _ (2) Carla Liuzzo is the covert government agent assigned to the course I attended _ (3) my forum posts run counter to CONTEST’s dictates _ (4) Carla Liuzzo instructs the course tutor, Mr. Wright, to openly criticize me and later to mark down my assignments in order to send me the message that I am no longer welcome in the program _ (5) Mr. Wright is instructed by Carla Liuzzo to change the topic in week 8 when the discussion no longer conforms to CONTEST’s dictates _ (6) Dr. Rofe is forced to second Mr. Wright’s unfair marks and to

threaten me _ (7) my appeals for fair treatment are ignored _ (8) I inform Dr. Rofo that unless my e-tivity 4 is marked fairly and the forum discussion in week 8 returns to the designated subject I will quit the course _ (9) Dr. Rofo refuses to re-assess my e-tivity 4 and conceals the fact that I can appeal his decision and that I am entitled to seek the help of the Education Unit in the Students' Union to appeal his decision _ (10) in the absence of further avenues of appeal for fair treatment, I am forced to quit the program _ (11) I attempt to recover my fees from Dr. Rofo _ (12) he refuses and when I insist he informs me that he does not have the authority to refund me more than a nominal amount _ (13) I appeal to Professor Phythian _ (14) he supports the fiction that my assignments were marked fairly and that there was no censorship and decides that I am not entitled to a refund _ (15) I appeal to Professor Murphy _ (16) she supports all previous decisions but softens her predecessors' stance in regard to the fair treatment of my assignments; she nevertheless decides to refund my fees _ (17) I seek to appeal further since none of my complaints had been addressed and because it had become clear that the university collaborates with the government in censoring the academic environment _ (18) I am denied access to the university's final procedural review stage _ (19) I ask the university to issue a completion of procedures letter so I can take my appeal to the OIA _ (20) the university refuses to even acknowledge my request let alone issue the letter _ (21) I reiterate my request for a completion of procedures letter _ (22) the university once again refuses to even acknowledge my request let alone issue the letter _ (23) I lodge a complaint against Leicester with the OIA without the completion of procedures letter.

In assessing my complaint you have considered the chain of events only from the causal point 11 onward, and have avoided the previous points which are fundamental to understanding the case and to uncovering the root cause of the conflict between Leicester University and me, which is the existence of a covert and illegal surveillance and censorship program. Furthermore, you have conveniently distorted the facts when stating that I voluntarily quit the program. Last but not least, you have refused to acknowledge the university's many breaches and violations of its regulations and procedures. This has allowed you to issue the myopic and blindsided preliminary decision that there were no grounds to progress my complaint to the final procedural review stage since I had been granted the refund of fees.

III.3. Regarding paragraph 18

Given that the OIA appears to be in a conflict of interest situation, it would be appropriate to follow rule 6.9.2 of its Regulations and recommend that "the complaint would be better considered in another forum". In this case, I believe only an authority outside Britain would have the necessary independence and impartiality to render a fair and just verdict. The proper forum, as far as I can ascertain, is the European Court of Human Rights at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg.

III.4. Regarding paragraph 22

The emails you chose to quote here in isolation and selectively should not be viewed as a complete and/or final expression of my complaint. They were not intended to be such. The Student Complaints Procedure Formal Complaints Forms (see File 1 & 2) I filled out are the documents that describe the full extent of my complaint. They are also predated by the many emails I wrote to Mr. Wright and Dr. Rofo in which I ask for fair treatment of my assignments and forum posts. You have conveniently and conspicuously chosen to overlook these.

IV. THE BROADER PICTURE

I would now like to express a few thoughts on the implications of the surveillance and censorship program (henceforth referred to as SAC) whose existence Britain is working so hard to conceal.

IV.1.

SAC is widespread. The chance of me landing the only two censored programs and universities in the country is very remote. All things being equal, it is reasonable to assume that under CONTEST's auspices SAC is operational in most if not all British universities and spans across a variety of faculties and programs the government deems sensitive. As such, it probably covers not only political courses but also nuclear physics, aviation, computer information systems, and electrical engineering, to name but the most obvious. In the name of defending Britain's "*shared values*" and "*community cohesion*" covert censorship is now the order of the day in Britain's universities. So much for academic freedom and the sanctity of the academic environment!

IV.2.

While SAC was instituted with the intent to safeguard Britain from terrorist attacks, it is now conveniently used and abused for whatever purpose serves the people in charge of the program. No one in their right mind can maintain that I was thrown out of Oxford and Leicester because my ideals and ideas mirror those of Islamic militants or terrorists. On the contrary, the record shows that my forum contributions stand in defence of democracy's most cherished values and Enlightenment's forgotten humanist ideals. There is no greater threat to today's brand of brutal capitalism and cruel Islamic fundamentalism than Enlightenment's forgotten humanist ideals. The conviction with which I promoted these ideals and the forcefulness with which I attacked and criticised the current capitalist world order and its asymmetrical justice is what has infuriated the government's censors (See Files 13 to 18, which contain the forum discussions from week 1 to week 7 at Leicester. If I could I would also present you with the forum discussions at Oxford but the university has stolen my intellectual property.) What has also infuriated the censors is that my allegiance is to human rights for all (and not just for my fellow citizens or for the members of my social class) and not to narrow national interests, especially when they are defined as who gets the biggest share of the global economic pie and who exploits whom in this brave new world of emerging global government under American hegemony. That kind of

thinking and acting belongs to the past (or at least ought to) and has no place in this day and age when humanity struggles to find unity in purpose and to solve problems that are common to mankind as a whole and that unless resolved threaten human civilization itself and the very survival of the species.

IV.3.

CONTEST is by definition and by necessity blatant censorship and SAC is now being used and abused to achieve a broader neoconservative and imperialist agenda. Seizing the unique opportunity provided by Al Qaeda, the elites lost no time disabling the nation's institutions designated to protect human and civil rights by throwing an umbrella of surveillance and control over the entire nation and bullying and/or co-opting the people in charge of Britain's vital institutions. The true scope of this is, pure and simple, to fabricate consent when it is necessary to do so in order to preserve what Britain's elites see as their birthrights: their wealth, privileges, power, and the right to meddle in and control the destinies of other nations. Never mind manufacturing consent, that was too laborious and unsafe, the Anglo-Saxon world, with the UK and the US at the forefront of this new world order, is now in the business of fabricating consent and SAC is just another weapon in their ever-growing arsenal of social controls.

IV.4.

Contemplate for a minute the paradox entailed by the notion that Britain's "shared values" and "community cohesion" (see CONTEST document) should be defended from places like Qatar (which is a tribal society that professes Islam as its religion and polygamy as a social custom, where the emir and his cohorts control all the wealth and have unrestricted power to do as they please, and where 1.2 million foreigners are treated no better than indentured slaves) and by people like Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned, the emir's favourite wife and a woman that sports multimillion dollar yachts, whose clan members, the Missneds, control the security services, whose life is shrouded in secrecy, and whose fabulous wealth gives her privileges Westerners can only dream of.

Of course, that is not how the people who control Britain see Qatar. Qatar, as far as they are concerned, is the same as Britain: a monarchy where the elites control all the power and wealth and with whom it is easy to strike shady and illegal deals of convenience because they both have to defend societies based on gross inequality. Qatar, in their assessment, is the ideal place from whence to censor and control British and foreign subjects. It is the world's largest exporter of gas, which means that vast sums of money can be funnelled into spy activities while masked as legitimate energy transactions. It is the home of Al Jazeera, which can report and criticize anything and anyone in the West as long as they do not touch Qatar's ruling elite. With the Western media co-opted to cover up the existence of the spy program, Al Jazeera would have been the most likely media channel to expose this story. That channel is now shut because any whiff of SAC would lead to the emir and his favourite wife.

The emir is a graduate of the Sandhurst Military Academy and his country is an autocracy where human and civil rights mean nothing. Getting Qatar's collaboration in the spy program would have been very easy and would have involved one of his former colleagues at Sandhurst.

Mrs. Carla Liuzzo, the government spy I identified at Leicester works for the Qatar Foundation, based in Doha, Qatar. The Qatar Foundation is the brainchild of Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned, who is the favourite wife of Qatar's ruler, emir Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani. Sheikha Mohzah's Qatar Foundation was purportedly set up to bring world-class education to Qatar and has spent billions of dollars to attract some of the best American universities to Qatar, including Carnegie Mellon, Cornell, Georgetown, North Western and Texas A & M. As you can imagine, if they have an agreement with the British intelligence agencies to spy on foreign and domestic students studying in British universities, the same is being done to the Qatari and foreign students enrolled in the American universities now in Qatar. Obviously, this is happening with American approval and perhaps even as a result of America's initiative. Qatar, after all, is home to a huge American base that is the forward headquarters of America's Central Command, which feeds the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan with supplies and equipment. The Americans are the emir's closest allies, while the British are Qatar's second most important ally. One also has to ask, what other universities in what other countries are being censored from Qatar?

IV.5.

In order to protect our rights and freedoms the government of Britain decided that it is both wise and necessary to deprive us all indiscriminately of our rights and freedoms. When SAC is exposed, as I have done, the need to cover up its existence trumps any single individual's rights and freedoms. So it is that in order to cover up SAC's wilful violations of my rights and freedoms, the people in charge of the program at the MI5 and MI6 have deemed it necessary to also deprive me of the right to a fair trial, perverting the adjudicating process of universities, silencing the Information Commissioner's Office (my appeal there to this day has yielded nothing but a computer generated case number, Case Reference Number RFA0295154), silencing the Equality and Human Rights Commission (who has refused to investigate my case and transferred its responsibilities unto the OIA, see File 8), instructing the police constabularies of Oxford (see File 9) and Leicester (see File 10) to refuse me the right to protest peacefully and to even issue veiled threats if I enter the country, perverting even the office of the Governor General, the Queen's representative in Canada, who refused to allow me to protest on the Canadian soil where the official residence is located (see File 11). Of course, the media has been silenced not just in Britain but also in Canada and throughout the western world since intelligence sharing agreements between allied nations trump their citizens' human rights. I have contacted just about every important newspaper in Western Europe, Australia, Canada and the US, but I have yet to hear from any. Were it not for Mr. Paunescu, who is truly a lion among sheep, I would have been screaming in the wind because the so-called free press of the so-called free world has long ceased to exist. Were it not for Mr. Paunescu, who some two decades ago

saved my father's life from the communists, I doubt I should have been allowed to live long enough to write this appeal. Today's capitalists would have seen to that.

The cancer that CONTEST represents has gripped even the European Commission. A complaint I lodged with the Commissioner for Education, Mrs. Androulla Vassiliou, to ascertain if Britain is in violation of education law and human rights, yields a response from Martin Schieffer, Acting Head of Unit F1 (Fight Against Terrorism), of the European Commission Directorate-General (see File 12). Since when, I ask, are the European Commission's terrorism experts in charge of education and human rights? There is only one logical explanation for this. SAC exists with the approval of the European Commission and may even extend to other countries in the EU. At the very least, Britain implements SAC with the full knowledge and consent of the European nations that make up the European Union, and shares the information gathered on a need to know basis. This information sharing and collaboration appears to be why the Romanian Embassy in Ottawa has refused to renew my Romanian passport when I attempted to do so in May of 2010.

Of course, Mr. Schieffer sees no evil and hears no evil even though the rights and freedoms I was deprived of are blatantly obvious. Here is a sketch of the violations I have been subjected to. The two universities expelled me from their programs in order to deny me the right to free expression, thus violating Article 10 (Freedom of Expression) of the European Convention on Human Rights, as well as to deny me the right to freedom of thought and conscience, thus violating Article 9 (Freedom of Thought, Conscience and Religion). They then set out to ignore or downright violate their own university regulations as well as the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act in order to deny me "*a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal*", thus violating Article 6 (Right to a Fair Trial). This violation continued at the Information Commissioner's Office, the Equality and Human Rights Commission, and now, it appears, at the OIA as well. Since these violations are motivated by discrimination of my political opinion, the parties in question have also clearly violated Article 14 (Prohibition of Discrimination), which states: "*The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status.*" They have violated Article 2 (Right to Education) of the first Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights, which states that "*No person shall be denied the right to education.*" Last but not least, Oxford and Leicester universities, the police constabularies of Oxford and Leicester, and the Governor General of Canada have deprived me of the right to protest by refusing to grant me permission. All these rights are enshrined in British, European and international law.

IV.6.

In the name of security, a regime of global oppression is being forged. This regime has no respect for human rights and civil liberties and has perverted the national and international institutions entrusted with safeguarding our rights and freedoms to such an extent that the constitutions of individual nation states are mere words on paper. It has also annihilated the protections previously afforded by citizenship, so much so that the social contracts implied by nationality are rendered null and void. This is occurring because the ideology of greed (Anglo-Saxon free market capitalism) is in a life and death struggle with the ideology of hatred (Wahhabi Muslim fundamentalism). We have all become victims of this struggle.

So you see, Mrs. Draper, is this the kind of world you want your children to live in? I certainly don't and I will not bend until the free world is free once again and until the rights and freedoms our forefathers have bled and died for are fully restored for our children to enjoy.

V. PERSONAL TOLL

The distance that separates us would make it easier for you to treat my appeal as an abstraction and my anguish as a faint call from across the ocean. But there is nothing abstract about the facts I have laid out before you, and nothing pleasant about the struggle I am engaged in. I assure you I am made of flesh and blood like everyone else, and like everyone else I love and fear, I hate and doubt. I have a family to love and to nurture and a newborn son to groom into a man and every day I thank my lucky stars for having been blessed with good health and good fortune.

My life was turned upside down when my pursuit of knowledge at Oxford and Leicester resulted in my expulsion and subsequently in the systematic stripping down of every right I thought I had both as a Canadian and Romanian citizen. I woke up in a world of Kafkaesque absurdity and with every day the hypocrisy I uncover grows in proportion and turns the world I knew into a monster I don't recognise. Since the day of my expulsion from Oxford my life has been a rollercoaster of abuses and violations. Standing up for my rights and for my dignity has not been easy. I am paying a high price. To give you a full picture of the price I am paying would take dozens of written pages so I will only give you the briefest of accounts.

My wife and I have already separated twice over this because the time and effort it takes to resist being railroaded has taken a terrible toll on our relationship. I have become alienated from my older brother because, it appears, he is afraid to be red flagged by association with me. As a practitioner of nuclear medicine he requires security clearance. I have spent over 1500 hours appealing and fighting for my rights and for justice and this has taken time away from my sons. I have decreased my work load considerably in order to keep up with the work required to fight for justice and this has affected my family's standard of life. Most friends remain loyal but others have distanced themselves. My health has suffered.

I urge you not to become a party to this monstrosity. I urge you to be fair and brave. It is a lot to ask, I know, but if SAC is to be stopped and our democracies restored to health it is people like you and I who must take a stand. I have drawn a line in the sand. I can no longer in good conscience be part of a society that is hypocritical to the core and a mere shadow of its former self. Until such time as Canada and Romania openly condemn CONTEST and SAC and fully restore the rights, protections and freedoms promised by citizenship and defended by law, I cease to be a citizen of either country and assume statelessness. To this end, I return my Canadian passport to our common Head of State, the Queen, via you, and my Romanian passport to the President of Romania, via Mr. Paunescu.

If I am the last man standing, then so be it. If I am to be the conscience of the western world, then I will assume the burden thrust upon me without complaints. I am an unlikely candidate, mind you, for I am no saint. But I am also not a coward or an idiot; for one must be a coward not to stand up in defence of mankind's most hallowed rights, and an idiot not to see the hellish world this is taking us straight into.

I hope to have supplied all the evidence you need to reassess your preliminary decision in line with the best practices of jurisprudence.

Sincerely,

Kevin Galalae